



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,965	12/15/2003	Fernando Salazar	LOT920030070US1 (024)	1335
46321	7590	02/25/2010		
CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP			EXAMINER	
STEVEN M. GREENBERG			TO, BAOQUOC N	
950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 3020				2162
BOCA RATON, FL 33487				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/25/2010	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/734,965	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SALAZAR ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> BAOQUOC N. TO	<b>Art Unit</b> 2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2009.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,4,5,9,12,13,17,20 and 21 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 7-8, 15-16 and 23-24 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 17 is amended in the amendment filed on 10/23/2009.

Claim pending: 1, 4-5, 7-9, 12-13, 15-17, 20-21 and 23-24.

Claims 2-3, 6, 10-11, 14, 18-19 and 22 are canceled.

Claims 1, 4-5, 7-9, 12-13, 15-17, 20-21 and 23-24 are pending in this application.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 03/12/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues "independent claims 17 has been amended to clarify that the claim is directed to a data transform...."

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's argument. Applicant's claimed invention in claim 17 direct to both method and a tool such as a program in paragraph 0031cited as "the present invention can be realized in hardware, software, or a combination of hardware and software..." Applicant amended the claim to over come 101 problem based on *In re Bilski*, 545 F.3d 943 \*Fed. Cir. 2008) (en banc); However, the claim is directed to a software rather than a method as claimed claim. Since, application specification discloses the current *invention can be hardware, software, or a combination of hardware and software.*

Applicant argues "the failure of the examiner to consider the limitation of "learning process", learning management system", "LMS", "user information", "course information" and "e-learning model" is clear reversible error..."

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument. As claimed in the claimed in invention, the main point of the invention to convert the object from one format to another format such as target database. The user information and course information from a source database in an e-learning model are just data. Data is data and if the system can transform one data to another data then the system can transform any types of data

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 17, 20-21 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because Claim 17 recites a data transformation tools for transforming user information and course information comprising: a data transformation utility adapted to convert the user and course information..., a data matching utility adapted to determine if an existing directory containing object.... and data loading utility adapted to load...which shows data modules to perform the transformation tool. Therefore, the recited transformation tool in claim 17 is program per se or software per se. Software per se is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process. Software per se is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Software per se is not a combination of substances and therefore is not a composition of matter.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1, 4-5, 9, 12-13, 17 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al. (US. Patent No. 6,016,501) in view of Prompt et al. (US. Patent No. 6,985,905 B2) and further in view of Whitehurst et al. (US. Patent No. 6,978,115 B2).

Regarding on claim 1, Martin teaches a method of transforming a user information and course information from a source database in an e-learning model to a target database in a learning management system, the method comprising:

Converting the user information and course information to a format compatible with the target database, the converted user information and course information containing object identification information (if the source database 104A uses a different database management system than the target database, the transform block may be required to transform the data to the target database format) (col. 9, lines 35-39); and

Loading the converted into the target database (the transform block may be required to transform the data to the target database format to enable storage in the database 104B) (col. 9, lines 36-39).

Martin does not explicitly teaches matching object identifiers with corresponding object identifiers related to the object identification information contained in the converted user information and course information if there is an existing directory containing object identifiers related to the object identification information containing in the converted user information and course information; and storing the unmatched object identifiers for manual handling and the user information and the course information form a source data in an e-learning model to a target data base in a learning management system. On the other hand, Prompt discloses teaches matching object identifiers with corresponding object identifiers related to the object identification information contained in the converted user information and course information if there is an existing directory containing object identifiers related to the object identification

information containing in the converted user information and course information (as corresponding to this is contrasted with conventional LDAP directories which require data to be extracted for the authoritative source of the information and transformed into a format matching the LDAP schema of the directory...) (col. 16, lines 55-62). This suggests the concept of matching object of the convert source into the object of LDAP format and obviously the unmatched have to be manually handled and stored. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify martin's system to include the matching the object in the converted source to the object of the LDAP as disclosed in Prompt in order to allow the converted data to be merge into the directory which uses for processing.

Claim 9 is a computer-readable storage medium storing a computer program which when executed performs a method of transforming source data from a source database to a target database in a data management system the method performs the step similar to claim 1; therefore, claim 9 is rejected under the same reason as to claim 1.

Claim 17 is a data transformation tool of a computer system for transforming source data from a source database to a target database in the data management system, the system perform the step similar to claim 1; therefore, claim 17 is rejected under the same reason as to claim 1.

Regarding on claim 4, Martin teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising updating the source database to include the object identifiers contained in the existing directory if a match is found (col. 5, lines 33-38).

Claim 12 recites the same limitation as to claim 4; therefore, claim 12 is rejected under the same reason as to claim 4.

Claim 20 recites the same limitation as to claim 4; therefore, claim 20 is rejected under the same reason as to claim 4.

Regarding to claim 5, Martin discloses the concept of claim 1, wherein the object identification information and the object identifier relate to names of user of the learning management system (the extracted data source are the user names) (col. 9, line 32).

Claim 13 recites the same limitation as to claim 5; therefore, claim 13 is rejected under the same reason as to claim 5.

Claim 21 recites the same limitation as to claim 5; therefore, claim 21 is rejected under the same reason as to claim 5.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 7-8, 15-16 and 23-24 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Contact Information***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Baoquoc N. To whose telephone number is at 571-272-4041 or via e-mail BaoquocN.To@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 8:00 AM – 4:30 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached at 571-272-4107.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follow:

(571) –273-8300 [Official Communication]

/Baoquoc N To/

Application/Control Number: 10/734,965

Art Unit: 2162

Page 9

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162